

killed it yet or not, but after what I have heard this morning I am sure they are going to. Senator Beutler made the statement earlier, I believe, and Senator Beutler, correct me if I am wrong, that we legislators mess around too much with the criminal code and that the bill as offered this morning is more or less doing that and that we are trying to provide, or Senator Hoagland is, to provide different penalties for special institutions or buildings. As I pointed out when I presented my bill, LB 86, which pertains to assault and sexual assault against the elderly, as a Senator who is messing around with the criminal code, we have a separate penalty for raping a girl under 16 as opposed to if you rape a girl 16½ or 17. So if you have a separate penalty for that, evidently society views it as something that is more heinous, although the reason I am told that we have that statute is because under 16 they are unable to give their consent. I think in today's society there is probably an awful lot more than we know that do give their consent. But be that as it may, we do have separate penalties for separate crimes, I mean for separate age groups at least. I am not sure if I agree with Senator Hoagland's bill. I am not sure if I agree with the committee amendments, but I merely want to point out that as legislators sometimes we see a fallacy perhaps in the criminal code and we try to correct it or we try to enhance the penalties or the laws a little bit better. So I would say that in refutation to Senator Beutler's argument that we shouldn't mess with the criminal code, perhaps we shouldn't mess with any of the statutes that we have today in the State of Nebraska if that is the logic of it. Thank you, senators.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I think it needs to be said, these committees are not clubs. They may be in the minds of some people but not to me. I don't have to sit there and go along to try to get along. Let them decide to go along with me, to get along with me. But that is not going to be the way it will be. Now it has been suggested that you adopt the committee amendment. This is absurd, the scenario, I think Senator Pirsch laid it out or whoever did, if Senator Pirsch didn't then I apologize for mentioning her, but you should adopt the committee amendment which strikes the material from the bill that Senator Hoagland wants. The committee amendment would substitute itself for Senator Hoagland's bill. Then let Senator Hoagland come back and try to put his bill into what originally was his bill but has now become rewritten by the Judiciary Committee. That makes no sense, not to me. Why don't you reject the committee amendment? Let Senator Hoagland present his bill which, by the way, I think doesn't